Prospective witnesses-Dealey Plaza- ~~John Martin~~ Robert J Hughes 1/5/69
(photographers and photographs) Harold Weisberg

In recommending the calling of ~~Martin~~ Hughes, I have in mind merely the subpenaing of his suppressed 8 mm movie and its offering into evidence and display to the Jury - plus the showing of one or more slides and possibly the comparison with FBI Exhibit 29 of them attachments to CD1, the initial FBI summary report of 12/9/63.

I go into this in PHOTOGRAPHIC WHITEWASH. The appendix includes two of the available documents, all suppressed. The picture was not used by the Commission and it was variously but not accidently misrepresented in the text of the Report and under "Speculations and Rumors". Perhps both times were in the latter. PW will be accurate.

The Report places the time of this picture ten minutes wrong. The FBI documents I publish both state it was taken the very moment of the assassination. It shows no one in that sixth-floor window. Someone would have had to have been with the "motorcade in front of the building" (approx) for him to have fired a shot from it in time to hit the President. I think Sprague's estimate of the maximum time between the last frame of this movie and the first shot as speculated by the Commission was about 7 seconds. This is hardly enough time for even the best marksman to get in place, get his target in his telescopic sight (which requires much more time than open sights) and then squeeze his shot off. Particularly is this true with the tree between him and his intended victim. Hoover had to crop this picture to misrepresent it. The actual film does, as the reports indicate, show the entire building. More, it shows all of Dealey Plaza toward Main St., where Martin was standing, and much of the east side of Houston.

The use of the ~~Martin~~ Hughes film, aside from its utter destructiveness to everything official and every official intent and purpose, not only proves Oswald was not an assassin, for it goes much further. It shows there was no one in that window (hence the rifle was a plant, part of the Oswald framing), that there was official knowledge of this, and that, whether or not all the federals sat down and engaged in a conscious conspiracy, they did combine in this fraud.

Particularly if this is bracketed with my recommendation on Carolyn Arnold and the Loveladys and that sequence of pictures, would this be effective before the ~~xx~~ jury and in the record.

If you go a step further and subpena their unused footage from CBS, you can certainly get your revenge from them. Bob Richter spoke to me one day at the Archives. I then drove him to CBS and a New York Times man to his office at the end of the working day. Even with my published work as an index he could not find the Lovelady reports. He asked me for them and I sent them to him (I have the covering letter). I suggested that when he went to Dallas he re-enact what I said in WHITEWASH the government should have done, get Lovelady in the shirt he was wearing that day, stand him where the picture shows him, and get Altgens, with the camera and lens he was then using to take the duplicating picture from where he had stood 11/22/63. Richter did part of this. He got Lovelady and that shirt and without any effort to duplicate the conditions of 11/22/63 photographed him in color, motion. I have a few frames from this film (CBS did not give them to me). They show Richter with his back to the camera, etc., and Lovelady in the doorway. Now this film shows the shirt is nothing at all like the shirt on the man in the doorway in the Altgens picture. The CBS answer was simple: they suppressed the entire thing. They also did this at the last minute, for Richter phoned me from New York to get my permission to use my copyrighted material (a real rarity!) just before airing. As a matter of fact, if you subpena all of the CBS records on this, you will undouttedly find it in the original version of the four shows. It is not only that I recommend the sweetness of revenge, for that is minor. What this will show the

jury is some of the essential fact of the assassination plus some of the essential fact of the whitewashing and covering up. It will show that Oswald was a) not in that sixth-floor window -that nobody was and every important official who said otherwise had to know it, with some of them doctoring and suppressing evidence to make the lie seem credible;b) that he probably was on the first floor, with the same comment applicable;c) that there had to be a conspiracy to commit the murder. It will also suggest there was a conspiracy to frame Oswald and history, to lie and make the lie believed, to tell other than what happened as the official explanation of the murder.

Here I want to make a general comment on photographs and photographers, with the recommendation that, armed with the proper amount of salt, Sprague be consulted. We can go much further than I did in PHOTOGRAPHIC WHITEWASH. We can here get the photographers on the stand and introduce all the suppressed pictures into evidence. I think this is historically and legally important, for they all in one way or another bear upon conspiracy to kill and a possible conspiracy to hide the truth and frame. This will also bear very much on Clark and his refusal to allow agents to testify, his attacks on the investigation by you and us, and his possible refusal himself to be a witness.

There are other cautions I should urge upon you. Aside from the high possibility of inaccuracy on the part of careful researchers and writers, there is also carelessness and sensation-seeking. For example, Thompson, the first one who had the chance to use some of the pictures LIFE got, usually was wrong in his use of them. Here the Martin film is an excellent example. It shows other than he says, and in order to keep himself in the clear on this Hoover invoked (I think for the only time) the authority of another expert source, the Navy Photo Lab. He also misidentifies the policeman and the grassy-knoll ascent. The man he called, as I recall, Haygood, actually had to have been another of the uncalled police witnesses, Jackson, who seems to have disappeared. Beverly Brunson has done an excellent study of this for me. I turned it all over to Sprague. I think Tink also involved Hargis in this, that Hargis so said and was simply wrong. If Jackson can be located, perhaps he also should be a witness. There had to be some reason for keeping him under wraps when he was so close to the Presidential car (I think he was one of the right flankers, with Ghaney) and they were so anxious to show there was no one on the knoll. So, there is hazard in the use of the suppressed pictures, and that hazard is accuracy. The other side certainly knows the truth, whether or not they told it. They could really ruin an untruthful or wrong witness on cross. If you want, there can be a list of such witnesses and their pictures. Others are set forth in PHOTOGRAPHIC WHITEWASH, with photocopies of the evidence. Some who come to mind immediately are Montesano and Alyea. Others are Couch and Underwood. There are more than you need or can use, but some of this, I think, should be done. Here I interject a strong word of caution about the so-called "tramp" pictures, for my continuing inquiries in Dallas indicate they were arrested in a box car that was <u>not</u> at the TSBD but was at the post office. This is not far away, but it certainly is not there, where they could have been assassins. I forgot to tell you this. The time was after the assassination and before the Oswald arrest. I am not at the moment pushing this further because of priorities, but I will and to a degree have. I repeat, important and impressive as the pictures can be, they must be handled with utmost responsibility or this can be ruinous. The tramp pictures are but a single example. Imagine what would happen if some of the things said in public were said in court and then the other side could prove that the men were elsewhere and other than so often and persistently (even now, I understand, as recently as Saturday) represented by those there now should be no reason to trust at all.